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of specialized subdisciplines, of a marginal nature in the university, such as specialists in non-European areas. Though administratively part of the same recruitment drive as modern and contemporary historians, they in fact come from quite specific career paths.

The lack of research institutes in history, outside the university set-up, has made this subject a hunting preserve of the university. The Collège de France, the EHESS and the EPHE, for their part, are home to highly specialized minority groups with original profiles, with the CNRS forming the third space. Historical output as a whole has maintained constants in the long run: the core subject of study remains (except of course for ancient historians), incursions beyond the national boundary are limited to Western Europe or North America. The arrangements for exchange and academic mobility like those of the French schools in Rome and Athens, the French historic mission in Germany and Fulbright scholarships define the contours of the ‘known world’. The few historians to come out of it are in fact specialists of far-flung civilizations, trained in languages and philology, even in anthropology. Their belonging to the world of historians is thus purely theoretical and is the outcome of administratively carving up knowledge, which has little to do with actual practices. French historians of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries are mostly men (two-thirds, and representing three-quarters of the professors), graduates of the history ‘agrégation’, working on France or its immediate neighbours. Of the 2000 historians recorded in 2005, more than 40 per cent are contemporary historians. Those with the fastest career paths are undoubtedly the ‘nominaliens’, especially when they add they were former students of the French schools of Rome or Athens. History is without doubt one of the disciplines to show a marked overrepresentation of French elites. It is now surprising, therefore, that compared to other social sciences, history as a discipline should only have been slightly feminized and that rather late in the day. Only three university professors were women in 1965 and only 11 per cent lecturers. While there have been women at the École des Chartes since 1920, they only accounted for half the student population in the late 1940s. Curricula for the top stream have remained separate over a very long time. Men’s and women’s ‘agrégations’ only merged in 1976 and Écoles normales supérieures only went mixed in the mid-1980s. It is in ancient and medieval history that women are most numerous (over 40 per cent, so there are less than 35 per cent of them in modern and contemporary history). There are also many women in art history, which is explained by the fact that this discipline was replacing Latin in the women’s ‘agrégation’. While half of the lecturers are women, they constitute no more than a quarter of the professors and directors of studies.

These factors show how history ranks high in the hierarchy of academic disciplines: a highly standardized curriculum, strong presence of ‘nominaliens’, a dearth of women. There is also an extra-European Parisian centralism, since 44 per cent of posts are in the capital or the Paris area. The concentration of the discipline’s centres of prestige (EHESS, EPHE, Collège de France) partly explains this phenomenon. But above all else it is a measure of the enduring presence of the ideal historical circle revolving around such symbolically laden places as the National Archives and the National Library. The CNRS itself, despite an active policy of decentralization in the 1980s and 1990s, has been unable to upset this balance.

Emmanuelle Picard
interested in a less dogmatic history. Highly sensi-
tive issues, such as the worsening conditions of
the three million Hungarians still living outside
the country’s borders (most of them in socialist
countries) could now be addressed. With the pub-
lication in 30,000 copies, in November 1986, of
Erdély története, a three volume work of high qual-
ity, edited by the Academy of Sciences, Hungarian
historians became part of a fierce diplomatic battle with national communist colleagues from
Romania.

With the collapse of the communist system, es-
pecially in the first years of democratic transition,
history (re)writing became an arena open to pro-
fessional historians, amateurs, and also private
persons who finally felt free to tell their own stor-
ies, and to construct their personal narratives of
the recent past. Marxism suddenly disappeared,
along with the history of the working-class move-
ment. As a result of this fragmentation of the pub-
lic memory, the new Hungarian historiography
lacks the comprehensive syntheses of the last cen-
tury, with the exceptions of Ignác Romics’ best-
selling scholarly work Magyarsország története a
XX. században (1999) and the illustrated A magy-
arak kronikája (1995) edited by the director of
the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences, Ferenc Glatz.

In 1997 a public archive – renamed in 2003 the
Állambiztonsági Szolgálatok Történeti Levéltára (Historical Archive of the State Security Services) – of all declassified documents from the former Ministries of the Interior and Justice was created. The materials of the National Archives are avail-
able to researchers up until 1980; and, indeed, the documents of the Communist Party until 1989. Aware that they are walking in a minefield, many Hungarian historians of twentieth-century poli-
tical history have reservations concerning the sources produced by the secret services. These sources (still not fully accessible) are obviously necessary for the understanding of the Hungarian communist system, but their use also raises num-
merous methodological and ethical issues.

After 1989 universities regained much of their
previous entitlement to award higher-level degrees.
PhD-level education was introduced in 1993. The
Academy of Sciences lost its exclusive position
within professional history writing (and scientific
credentialling); its main task thus becoming the
construction of a modern, project-oriented and
not state-dependent academic life. A crucial role in
internationalization has been played by the Eng-
lish-language, postgraduate Central European
University, founded by George Soros in 1992, whose
networks comprise the Open Society Archives, in-
cluding the archives of Radio Free Europe, an
enormous collection on human rights and a huge
number of archival copies from the ex-Communist
regime. In 1991, in the capital city, intellectuals asso-
ociated with the ‘democratic opposition’ of the
1980s were given public funds to create the Az
1956-os Magyar Forradalom Történetének Doku-
mentációja és Kutatóintézete Közalapítvány (In-
stitute and Public Foundation for the History of the
1956 Hungarian Revolution). New research and
postgraduate study institutions include the XX.
Század Intézet (20th Century Institute) and the
Habsburg Intézet (Institute for Habsburg His-
tory), founded with the financial support of the
government.

Two important new museums have been opened in
the first decade of this century: the Terror Háza
(House of Terror), linked to the 20th Century In-
stitute, and focusing mainly on the communist dic-
tatorship, and the Holokausz Emlékközpont
(Holocaust Memorial Centre) devoted to the Hun-
garian Shoah, while a comprehensive collection of
Hungarian history can be found at the permanent
exhibition of the Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum (Na-
tional Museum), opened in 1996 to celebrate the
1100th anniversary of the Hungarian tribes’ arrival in
the Carpathian Basin. The Hadthérténeti Múzeum
(Museum of Military History) has also organized
important exhibitions devoted to military events of
the past, such as the 1848–49 Revolution.

Bálint Varga-Kuna and Stefano Bottoni
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1802 Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum (National Museum).
1826–30 Magyar Tudományos Akadémia (Hungarian Academy of Sciences).
1830 Verein für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde (Association for Transylvanian Studies) in Nagyszombat (Herrenstadt; Sibiu, Romania).
1840 Journal Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde (Archive of the Association for Transylvanian Studies) first published by the Association for Transylvanian Studies.
1850 Uj Magyar Múzeum (New Hungarian Museum).
1859 Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület (Transylvanian Museum Society) in Kolozsvár (Cluj, Romania).
1867 Magyar Történelmi Társulat (Hungarian Historical Association) and its Journal Századok (Centuries).
1891 Magyar Múzeum és Emlékhelyek Múzeuma (Museum of Military History) in Budapest.
1927 Magyar Szemle (Hungarian Review).
1950 Történeti Szemle (Historical Review).
1952 Uj Magyar Központi Levéltár (New Hungarian Central Archives) in Budapest.
1958 Magyarországi Intézet in Budapest (Institute of Hungarian Studies, later Tevki László Institute until its closure in 2007).
1993 Open Society Archives in Budapest.
1999 XX. Század Intézet (20th Century Institute).
2002 Terror Háza (House of Terror).
2004 Holokausz Emlékközpont (Holocaust Memorial Centre).
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POLAND

The Polish historiography of the nineteenth and
twentieth centuries may be divided into four pe-
riods related to the history of the Polish state and
nation. The first embraces the entire nineteenth
century until 1918, which was the period when
Russia, Prussia and Austria incorporated the form-
er territories of the Polish monarchy. The second
period comprises the years of the independent
Polish state (1918–39), the third comprises that of
German occupation (1939–45), while the fourth
spans the years between 1945 and 1989, the time of
communist rule. The fifth period covers the years
since 1989 and the fall of communism.

The beginnings of scientific historiography in
Poland reach back to the late eighteenth century –
the closing years of independent Poland. Adam
Naruszewicz, author of the multivolume Historia
narodu polskiego (A History of the Polish Nation, 1780–1824) is considered ‘the father of Polish his-
torography’. The partitions of the country did not
halt the development of Polish historiography. The
nobility, deprived of its political independence, at-
tached much significance to history, which was ex-
pected not only to provide guidelines for the future
but also to confirm Polish self-esteem. The To-
warzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk (Association of Friends of
Science), active in Warsaw after 1800, continued
Adam Naruszewicz’s work. The Archiwum Główne
Akt Dworych (Central Archives of Historical
Records) were created in 1808 and constituted an
important research resource for historians. Until
the mid-nineteenth century, Polish historians ob-
tained their academic degrees at German univer-
sities and transferred the German methodology
of history to Poland. The most important centres for
historical research and the training of historians
were the universities in Kraków, Lemberg (Polish
Lwów), Warsaw and, until its closure in 1834, Vilna
(Polish Wilno). With the exception of the Univer-
sity of Lwów, where until the 1880s German was
(with Latin) the official language of instruction, lectures on history were given in Polish. At Wilno,
and then Warsaw, the History Department was
chaired by Joachim Lelewel, the most outstanding
Polish historian of the nineteenth century and au-
thor of a republican synthesis of the history of
Poland: Uwagi nad dziejami Polski i lada jej (Re-
marks on the History of Poland and its People,
1844). The period between the two Polish uprisings
of 1830 and 1863 witnessed a growth of interest in
the history of law, economy, science, education, re-
ligion, and the Church, as well as in regional history.
The history of politics, however, still enjoyed the
pre-eminent position. Although after the uprisings
the Russian administration no longer tolerated
Teaching in Polish and the propagation of national
ideas, Polish historiography grew further, mainly
through the efforts of higher learning and research
institutions in the Austrian parts of the country,
and of scholars in exile.

During the 1860s, Polish historiography entered
a new phase of professionalization carried for-
ward mainly by historians who had received their
training at universities. Criticism was deemed to be
the key task of the historian, and great significance was attached to a genetic explanation of historical facts. Solid institutional bases were laid for the further development of Polish historiography. A department of Polish history was established at the University of Kraków in 1869, and a department of general history in 1871. The University of Lemberg/Lwów created its department of general history in 1871, and the department of the Polish history in 1881. From 1864 onwards, the source publications entitled *Monumenta Polonicæ Historiæ* were issued in Kraków. Publishing activities were undertaken by the Komisja Historyczna Towarzystwa Naukowego Krakowskiego (History Commission of the Kraków Scientific Society, 1869), which later became the Akademia Umiejętności (Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1872) in Kraków. Founded in Lwów were the Polskie Towarzystwo Historyczne (Polish Historical Society, 1886) and the journal *Kwartalnik Historyczny* (Historical Quarterly, 1887). The first general convention of Polish historians was held in 1880. But the Austrian part of the country remained the only Polish-speaking region with a more complex scientific infrastructure; in the Russian and Prussian parts the institutional basis was extremely weak. The central issue for numerous discussions and polemics was the reason for the fall of the Polish state in the eighteenth century. The so-called Kraków school (Walerian Kalinka, Michał Bobrzyński, Stanisław Smolka) passed harsh judgement on Poland’s past and propagated the theory that the Poles themselves were responsible for the fall of their country (Michał Bobrzyński, *Dzieje Polski w zarysie*, 1879 – An Outline History of the State). During the 1880s and 1890s, historians in Warsaw, most notably Tadeusz Korzon and Władysław Smołow, began to contest the views of the Kraków school. They emphasized Poland’s rebirth after the first partition and blamed aggressive neighbouring states for the country’s collapse. The third important centre of historical research was the University of Lwów, where historians concentrated on source research, avoiding extensive historical reflection and any involvement in politics. Their views on the history of Poland were based on the rule of the golden mean, and they eschewed extreme attitudes of any kind.
The institutions created by Polish exiles in Western Europe played an important role in the development of Polish historiography during the nineteenth century. Especially the Bibliothèque Polonaise (Polish Library) in Paris, founded in 1838, and the Muzeum Narodowe Polskiego (Polish National Museum) in Rapperswil (Switzerland), established in 1870, took on the mission of the former Polish state and the nation's cultural and political past. The first national museums—the Czartoryski Museum founded in 1801 in Kraków, and subsequently the Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie (National Museum in Kraków, 1879) and the Muzeum Narodowe w Poznańiu (National Museum in Poznań, 1882) —performed the same function.

The turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries saw the research infrastructure in the Russian part of Poland undergo great changes. In 1905, during the period of partial liberalization from Russian politics, the journal Przegląd Historyczny (Historical Review) was founded in Warsaw. In 1906, the Towarzystwo Miłośników Historii (Polish Historical Association) was formed, and then, in 1907, the Towarzystwo Naukowe Warszawskie (Warsaw Scientific Society). In 1915, under German occupation, history teaching was resumed at the reconstituted University of Warsaw.

A relatively new phenomenon was research on the history of the nineteenth century. Contemporary Polish historiography was initiated by Szymon Askenazy, the author of Książę Józef Poniatowski (Prince Józef Poniatowski, 1905) and Napoleon a Polska (Napoleon and Poland, 1918–19). Polish aspirations for independence were strengthened by the development of historical and military research. The history of law also advanced apace. In the years between 1900 and 1918, economic history emerged as a separate field of historical research (Franciszek Bujak). Enormous progress was made in research on the history of culture, with particular regard to Polish science and education (Antoni Karbowiak, Jan Ptasnik, Stanisław Kot). The international congresses of historians, beginning with the 1900 Congress held in Paris, helped Polish historians establish contacts with scholars from other European countries long before they organized the National Committee of Poland in 1923.

The second period spanned the years of independent Poland (1918–39). The first years of independence were difficult ones for Polish historiography because there were insufficient funds to satisfy even basic needs. Scientific societies and historical journals found it extremely difficult to survive, and numerous source publications were discontinued. After 1918, historical research attracted less interest than at the time of the partitions. But history took advantage of the further development of higher education in the new republic. New universities were founded in Poznań (1919), Wilno (1919), and Lublin (1918), and new departments of history opened at the Universities of Warsaw and Łódź, and at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków.

The Polish Historical Society played a very important role in these developments. After its integration into the Polish Historical Association it was transformed into the Polskie Towarzystwo Historyczne (Polish Historical Society) in 1924. It organized the Conventions of Polish historians (held in 1925, 1930 and 1935) and published the journal Kwartalnik Historyczny (Historical Quarterly).

Apart from the universities, the years 1918–39 saw the founding of a number of scientific institutions which pursued historical research, among them the Wojskowe Biuro Historyczne (Military Historical Bureau) and the Instytut Badania Historii Najnowszej (Institute for Modern History Research, 1923). Archival services were reorganized and modernized, and a number of new libraries and museums were opened. Similar developments took place in the system of historical museums. This period saw the foundation of the Muzeum Wojska Polskiego (Museum of the Polish Army, 1920), the Muzeum Historyczne Warszawy (Historical Museum of Warsaw, 1936), and the Muzeum Narodowe w Poznańiu (National Museum in Warsaw, 1938).

The publication of various new historical periodicals was of particular significance for the further development of Polish historiography. In Warsaw, besides Przegląd Historyczny, the following periodicals were published: Przegląd Historyczno-Wojskowy (Historical and Military Review), Reformacja w Polsce (Reformation in Poland), Niepodległość (Independence), and Archiwum. The second important centre for the publication of periodicals was Łódź, where, apart from Kwartalnik Historyczny, the following came out: Rocznik Dziejów Społeczno-Gospodarczych (Yearbooks of Social and Economic History), Przewodnik Historyczno-Prawny (Guidebook on History and Law), Miesięcznik Heroldycy (Heraldic Monthly). Rocznik Historyczny (Historical Yearbooks) were published in Poznań, and Rocznik Krakowski (Kraków Yearbook) in Kraków. The most important new publishing initiative was Polski Słownik Biograficzny (Polish Biographical Dictionary), the first volume of which was published in Kraków in 1935. Moreover, a journal devoted to the history of the Church—Poloniae Sacra (Holy Poland)—also began publication in Kraków.

After 1918, history chairs tripled in number (from 14 in 1900 to 41 in 1928). History became an occupation for as many as 1550 people, most of whom worked in schools, archives, libraries or museums. There were also teachers, priests, public officials, and military personnel who engaged in historical inquiry. The number of qualified historians grew, some of them with doctorates or even post-doctoral degrees. The majority of them lived in Warsaw, which had become the centre of historiographic activities, followed by Kraków and Łódź. Łódź, Toruń and Katowice were the cities without universities that were most active in history. Only a small group of historians were tied to universities and scientific and research institutions.

The horizons of Polish historiography broadened considerably. It was only now that researchers began systematic inquiry into the history of antiquity, the Byzantine Empire, the Middle Ages, and Marxian methodology. Historians focused more on the history of Poland and Lithuania. A number of new syntheses were published, most notably Dzieje Polski (History of Poland, 1923–25) by Waclaw Sobielski; Dzieje Polski nowoczesnej (History of Modern Poland, 1936) by Władysław Konopczyński; and Dzieje kultury polskiej (History of Polish Culture, 1930–31) by Aleksander Brueckner. During the inter-war period, the multivolume Wielka Historia Powszechna (Great General History, 1934–39) was issued.

Increasing numbers of women took up historical studies, and they found employment as teachers at schools of higher education or as researchers. Polish historians participated in numerous international scientific undertakings, and in 1933 they hosted the Seventh International Convention of Historians.

During the third period—the years of the Second World War and of the German occupation of Poland in 1939–45—all universities and scientific institutions were closed by the occupiers. Universities went underground, and historians were trained at secret universities established in Warsaw (also with historians expelled from Poznań by the German occupiers), Kraków and Łódź. Around 30 per cent of the country's historians were killed as a result of the extermination policy pursued by the German and Soviet invaders against the Polish intellectual elite. And large collections held by archives, libraries and museums were destroyed.

The fourth period comprised the communist rule of Poland between 1945 and 1989. After 1945, the reconstruction and development of historiography continued amid changed political and ideological circumstances. The loss of the Eastern territories, and the geographical expansion of Poland towards the West, changed the locations of universities and other research institutions. Important centres of historical research—Wilno and Łódź—now lay outside Polish borders and were transformed into Lithuanian and Ukrainian universities. Higher education was further developed. During the first years after the war, new universities were opened in Lublin (1944), Łódź (1945), Wrocław (1945) and Toruń (1945). Thereafter, historical research was also conducted at the University of Silesia, founded in Katowice in 1968, as well as at the Universities of Gdańsk (1970), and Szczecin (1984). The new schools for secondary school teachers (in Kraków, Częstochowa, Katowice, Szczecin, Olsztyn, Zielona Góra, Gdańsk, Kielce, Słupsk, and Opole and, in the 1970s, Rzeszów) also had history on their curricula. The development of higher education resulted in the establishment of new history departments and institutions. Besides universities, the Polska Akademia Nauk (Polish Academy of Sciences), founded in 1953, with its Institute of History, and the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology became important centres of historical scholarship after 1945.

Besides the institutions now once again operating in the country, Polish institutions in exile also played a leading role in historical studies: the Józef Piłsudski Institute was founded in New York in 1943, followed by the Institute of History, named after General Sikorski in London (1945), and the Józef Piłsudski Institute in London (1947).

The experience of the Second World War and the expansion of Polish territory westwards revived research interest in the age of the Piasts and the manifold relations between Poles and Germans. In 1949, the party and state authorities imposed the soviet models on Polish historiography, and Marxian methodology was recognized as the only legitimate theory of history. The political changes that took place in 1956 freed Polish historiography from Stalinist distortions. During the 1960s, histori-
GERMANY (map p. 161)

German historiography is often described as having pioneered processes of professionalization, and it has developed all the characteristics of a modern academic discipline. This description is widely accepted, even to the point that Germany is viewed as a role model for the transformation of other national historiographies into disciplines.

History became part of the core curriculum at almost all German universities from the mid-nineteenth century onwards in a process accompanied by a sophisticated debate on methods. The latter resulted in a series of internationally respected textbooks defining how historians should deal professionally with texts and sources. This transformation was meant to make history a discipline on a par with the natural sciences, besides giving it a leading position in most of the philosophical faculties. The idea of the historian as a 'praeceptor Germaniae' teaching the fine arts of nation-building' emphasized his or her political role in legitimating the emergent nation-state and guaranteeing its cultural coherence. It was fundamental for the high prestige that historians enjoyed during the Wilhelm Empire (and to some extent thereafter as well). The seminar became famous among historians around the world as the format best suited to train students in the technique of reading sources critically.

Recent research has shown, however, that some doubts can be advanced regarding this rose-tinted picture. Firstly, it was not self-evident that the different regional traditions converged without resistance or delay into a single 'German' historiography; and the often privileged Prussian universities were far from being representative of country-wide developments. Only after more than half a century did standards for the recruitment of professors and the historian paradigm become accepted throughout Germany.

Secondly, the same applies to the international role model that German historiography allegedly represented. What was long seen as a process of coping the German seminar in various countries within and without Europe is now described in more nuanced terms as divergent ways to appropriate elements from the German model and mix indigenous nation-building's regional or local traditions into it. What is now emphasized is the mutual influence exerted by national fields on each other through the intensification of international contacts and competition in the form of cultural transfers.

This new emphasis leads to a third observation. At a number of points in the course of the twentieth century, German historiography isolated itself from the ongoing process of transnationalization. It did so by supporting the aggressive policy of the empire during the First World War and the Nazi regime from 1933 onwards. On several occasions in the first half of the century, it excluded historians seeking innovation outside the country. It consequently isolated the minority of truly republican professors, as well as leftist historians, and excommunicated Jews (or those defined by Nazi legislation as such) from the field. These exclusivist features raise serious doubts concerning the notion that German historiography formed a (pluralistic) academic field, and they suggest that at various points it provoked the emergence of counter-movements forced to seek institutions of their own. This process started with the fierce methodological quarrels of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when materialist approaches and cultural history came under attack. Moreover, non-European history was denied a place as a legitimate part of the field. Women had few chances of pursuing careers in history for most of the twentieth century, and leftist historians had good reason to feel discriminated against in a highly politized discipline. New and ultimately innovative coalitions with geographers, anthropologists and sociologists turned into a paradigm termed the 'Kulturraumforschung' (a historical explanation relating ethno-political claims to soil and culture). This was a powerful instrument for right-wing revisionist arguments against the Treaty of Versailles, and it fitted well with the racist scheme of interpretation favoured by the Nazis.

One of the distinctive features of German historiography's development during the second half of the twentieth century was its division into two branches. When exactly this occurred is disputed: it is located either directly at the time of the establishment of the two post-war states or later in the 1950s, when a new generation in the East felt sufficiently strong to separate from academia in the West, or was forced by the Communist Party to do so. Yet, even after the erection of the Berlin Wall,